

**Table D.101. Why respondents voted “for” the program**

To keep our waters clean, I am an avid fisherman
To get lake back to where it was.
For the people that use the lake and my grandchildren, it would clean up the lake, and maybe the algae is harmful to humans
It would return the lake to it's natural beauty sooner.
Aesthetic reasons to make things nice again
To remove the phosphorus
It would help clear the lake a little faster.
Clean up the water faster
Help clear the lakes up like it use to be. So when go swimming it will be cleaner.
Clean it up quicker and my grandchildren will benefit from it.
I would like the water to be clean.
Clean up the lake and water.
I am for alum treatments. If the money goes for the treatment. Not some industrial business. I don't want some fat cats getting rich. To fill pockets. They need to have them monitored. Not private business. Good ideas being turned into corrupt
Get the rivers cleaned up, which needs to be done.
It is good for the environment and I would like some bailout money. \$1,000
It would clear up the rivers
It would make the water clearer and bring the fish back faster and the water would be better to drink. Those waters go into the water treatment plant and this is what we drink
I love fish, especially bass. I love fishing. P I enjoy the lakes, it will clean them.
If it would return the lake to the newvalue state that would be good. Really you want to see it clear and not murky and dirty
Clean the water more.
Alum would clear up the algae faster. Anything is better than the way it is now.
To clean up for the future generations. To keep the state beautiful as possible.
Speed up the process.
To restore wildlife.
Killing the algae in the water.
Clean the lake quicker.
Natural product; good for the environment, looking at long-term benefits. P I'm sure they use Tenkiller lake for drinking water. It's a win-win situation.
I want it to benefit my children and grandchildren
I would vote for anything that would help the water for future drinking and swimming, I am an old farm girl and I know what I am talking about
It would clean up the lake and produce better quality of fish
We love to go fishing and no one wants to fish in a murky lake
Knowing that we are doing something to fix the problem, that there is a product out there that would work
Because the lakes are nasty and we like to go there for swimming and fishing and I would like to see them cleaned up
I guess we would if that's the only one time tax. Something needs to be done to clean it up.
Saves 10 years.

**Table D.101. Why respondents voted “for” the program**

Anything that would improve the fishing
Clear the water up. Help the wildlife
I got a lot of grandkids that like to hunt and fish. If this would clean up the water where the fish and animals aren't sick, it would be a good idea. I quit eating fish out of the lakes and rivers.
Because it would clear up [the] lake. If we don't do something now it will get worst. I have seen the body of water in Arkansas and it causes ugliness.
My grandchildren could enjoy the lake
At least it will create some jobs for only \$45. That's a great deal. And they will be working for the state so they will at least get some benefits out of it.
Reduce the amount of phosphorus
Make the lake and river return to its natural...help it progress sooner.
It would clear the lake up faster
Clearing the water up. Our fishing is no good any more. The water is starting to carry a smell. It would be good for it. If you could stop poultry litter that's a big start.
Anything to help bring the waters back to what they used to be: to let the fish and wildlife grow big again and make it safe for our children to swim again and for us to eat the fish and wildlife.
It'd clear lakes for grandkids great grandkids because they're going to go swimming. I know what my kids had to swim in this year it was awful went to the lake about 8 times this summer it was awful I didn't go in the water, you can't stop kids
Just the quicker process. That's it.
For all the reasons you told me also even if it takes 50 years we should be able to see changes faster and gradually in a couple of years if we use the alum
It would make it (the lake) more pure, wouldn't it?
For the sake of the kids to be able to play in clean water.
I like to hunt and fish
Help clear up the water situation. P no
Because my family loves to fish
Well, I'd like to see the lake cleaned up. P from what I heard the algae is bad over there, according to my friends
Clean the algae up. P it hasn't been cleaned up.
Clear the lakes and stuff and eventually help our drinking water.
It would help the plant to grow.
Having clean water is important
Clear the lake up for the future
Simple and safe
Simple
It would help the fish, clean the water. Important that they do in a timely matter and do what they say.
Well if it cleans up the rivers and lakes then I think it's good.
Clear up the algae in the water so the kids can go swimming.
It would be worth it
Kill the algae bring back the smallmouth bass,
To clean up the mess
Because I like clear water and I like to fish

**Table D.101. Why respondents voted “for” the program**

When I was in Vietnam , china and other countries the rivers were polluted and I don't want the rivers in my state to be polluted.
The cost. Fifty years instead of sixty years.
Clear up the river and make a better habitat for wildlife and human recreation
It will clean the water.
Need to stop the spread of algae to prevent future problems.
It would create jobs for people but for as it clearing up the lake its' not worth that much alum being put in the lake
I think it would clear the lake for my granddaughter if it was going to take that long
To have cleaner water in rivers and lakes would be good
To make the lake good look like it was in 1960
Clear up the lake sooner
See if it works
Clear the water
Needs to be done other lakes will have to be done later
Reduce the phosphorus in the body of water in which my family spends an enormous amount of time. There are a lot of people, statewide, that would be affected by this, not just people in sequoia county. It's a matter of making it known statewide.
Get rid if the algae and bring them back to what it was, with the fish and crap that was there before. Because I like to fish.
Make it be clear again.
It would clean up sooner
To help clean the water up
Because the alum does wonders. It cleans up the algae and preserve the fish
Because it's restoring Tenkiller lake and it would effect every one if the lake was clearer
Because it would clear the water up and make it more drinkable
For the children's future.
I'm all for saving our water.
It will help the people up there that use the water. And make a better place for our environment
If you don't have water you don't have anything
The Illinois river should be enjoyed by everyone.
It is better to do it now than to wait 10 years.
It would speed up the lake process of cleaning the lake
Small step for our segment of water management resources
Hopefully spreading the alum will clean up the water and more guidelines will be created to keep things like this from happening again
Clean up the lake like it was 50 years ago
I realize how horrible the visibility is, even deep at 60 feet. I would like to get the lake back to where it was in better condition would be good.
By the time the grandkids grow up there will not be any clean rivers
Speed up the process; they enjoy the lakes in Oklahoma; they'll see the change more quickly
To speed up the process of cleaning so I can see it and so could my daughter
To clean up the lake quicker because we have property there for the children and grandchildren water is

**Table D.101. Why respondents voted “for” the program**

precious you should take care of it
The cost and anything to help the environment sooner
Clear up the algae
Clean up the lake faster
To clean up the lakes
Go with the band and do the treatment process as long as it's monitored good
For the future for the children and my grandchildren for swimming and boating.
It would clean the algae because of the insects and fish and we have to take care of our environment and its a scenic river and it needs to be pretty.
I would have to change my vote to no until I find out more info. Such as will the alum come from ok. Or will others be getting the money from purchasing of the alum than Oklahoma. So I'll change my vote until I find out more.
If it's going to make the water and stuff better. The water is horrible here
Clean up the lake for my grandkids
To balance out the phosphorus and the business on the lake.
Better the water and save 10 years
It would save the fish and clear up the water.
Cleaning up the phosphorus.
Actually, what it would do is to speed up the natural process of cleaning up the water. I know the poultry industry and it is going to be difficult to regulate them.
We need it for the environment. Without treatment it might get worse. The faster it gets better, the better.
If it would clear all of the nasty green stuff out of the lake.
The lake will be cleaned up so that, even though I am only 21, I can take my family to the lake and it will be cleaner.
Faster clean up. No, because it will naturally return it will just take ten years longer
Ah make the lake safer for my grandchildren maybe not safer but more enjoyable. X umm it's a start to clean up the environment.
It will make water clean it will save the life of wild animal it's saving the environment so it's protecting our heath, it's automatically tied into our health, too. It's the same words

**Verbatim responses explaining why respondents voted “against” the program**

If respondents voted “against” the program in question W1 (“Now please tell me whether you vote for or against the alum treatments, which would cost your household a one time additional tax of \$ (BIDAMT).”), they were asked, “Why did you vote against the alum treatments?” Table D.102 below lists all of the responses people gave to this question.

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**

That's eighty dollars we could spend on utility bills or other necessities
I didn't mess up the lake, let them clean it up themselves
Too much money



**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**

Too much money
The cost the cost
Not worth it
Only saving ten years, and no immediate effect therefore tourists would not see an immediate effect thus no new tax dollars etc.
I think the poultry people should pay for it if it's a problem, I think if they are the cause they should pay for it. Will probably make chickens and turkeys go up
Because the only lake affected would be Tenkiller, if you stop the spreading they would naturally return to its natural state is they stop poultry litter so why would they need the alum
The time frame the number of years the difference is minimal
I just do
The money and also its only ten year difference
I think that's a lot of money to return the lake to 1960s conditions in fifty years vs sixty years. That is just a ten year advancement.
The price to my household.
I cannot afford that.
Why spend the money on that seem like it is a waist of money. Some fish eat algae. Stock the stream with fish that eat algae.
If bans goes into effect the lakes and river will automatic heal and replenish itself. Next there are more pressing issues than lake Tenkiller.
I think it should naturally take care of itself. Personally I'm not comfortable with voting for or against the ban on the poultry litter; I would have to know a lot more details about that. Farmers around here make my life happen.
Because I can't afford the \$405. It's too expensive for me. No, I think it's a good idea, but I can't afford it. I'd like to see it happen but I can't afford it.
It's going to clear anyway and ten years is not that big of a difference. I think there are more important things that need our attention.
I cant see 10 years different. When man gets into things its always messed up. Let nature take its course
Because the time difference is not that great. And it's expensive if it's going to take 50 years anyway.
I feel they can spend the money for other things. 10 years is not a big difference for so much money
I figured it was only an only a 10 year difference and people should not have to pay for it
Because I feel that the river needs cleaning up and if nature takes its course then the lake may heal itself.
Because they can't predict what the future is going to do in 60 years it isn't worth 405 dollars to clean up in 60 years
The fifty years as opposed to 60 years is not enough time when it will return naturally
They can spend the money somewhere else and that the conditions will return the river back to where it was in 60 years anyway
Personally I think we would be playing god that we would only be saving 1/6 of the time that it would be done naturally
Don't live there
Because it's the chicken farmers livelihood. It will return back in 10 years anyway.
Because they need to treat all of the rivers and lakes that have algae. Because they are just as bad
Because it does not concern any area around here

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted "against" the program.**

It's not the money. To me the state is asking the people to bail them out from something they didn't to when they let the poultry industry o this now they want us to bail them out.

Because it's only going to increase by 10 years. It restore on its own. Rather spend the money on something else.

They need to get the farmers that caused the mess and fine them and make them pay the higher tax because they are the ones who caused the phosphorus and the algae

I can't afford it we have a new baby coming and can't afford the tax

The expense for the taxpayer is too much for only a ten year difference

I tried to call project director

It does not involve me directly and ten years sooner would not effect my personal opinion on it

The company that is responsible should pay the tax. And it is only a ten year difference on the process.

I just don't trust anybody especially with money.

I never heard of algae in any lakes or rivers

Never been to the waters

I do not go the rivers or lakes.

Oklahoma cannot be trusted with a trust fund based on past experience, teachers retirement, toll roads, big time corruptions with legislators. The state has known about the dumping of poop in the waters for a long time. Just ban the practice.

The ten year difference; letting nature take care of it. P no

Too much money. P only a difference of 10 years in a 60 year picture

I think my money would better spend elsewhere in schools and public parks and starting a mandatory recycling program

The additional 10 years is not worth the added tax; he questions the human cost, he heard what it would cost in things living in the water but what does that mean to human cost; if it's just tourism, then just wait the extra 10 years

Because the lake will return to its prior condition by the stopping of litter and the natural way

Because pouring more chemicals into a water source to correct a problem that we created in the first place, is a bad idea. Throwing good money out to bad is not going to correct a situation that mother nature could correct herself.

Because the \$205 at one time is a lot of money for my household to pay, but if it were done in maybe three or four payments, I would be willing to do it, it is a good idea, the alum treatments.

Because it is only a difference of 10 years

I think it would be better to revert back naturally

I would prefer that they use the money for education or better bridges than the lake be improved 10 years faster

If the bans begins tomorrow it's going to take fifty years. I am almost fifty, I will never see the lake clear I understand it is for our children, if you get control of the poultry droppings and human waste yes, I would vote for it.

I will not benefit from it and I can spent the money on other things. I think the taxes are already too high. They should do it without raising our taxes. Should be put on television to let the people know.

Because of tax brackets, other areas not helping and only speeds it up by 10 years

Because the difference would only be 10 years for it to get clean and why go to that expense; she agrees that the ban needs to take place

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted "against" the program.**

The alum is put into the waters and floats to the bottom what would that chemical reaction do in about 20 years or about however long it takes for us to notice the effects of the alum on the bottom because animals live on the bottom of the water

Does not believe in the way the state spends tax money, don't believe in adding substances to the eco system, it doesn't need assistance

It's a good thing to take care of the environment, it's a lot of money to ask people to pay, and it's too much money to concentrate on one lake when there are others

10 years does not think it's worth it

I would like another company to do the work instead of the state

Can't afford it if I could I would vote for it

Because I can't afford it.

It's a matter of 10 years in 50 years it will be clear up with alum and in 60 year it will be cleared up without it

I don't think the number of years would decrease the expense

The time difference between the natural process and the chemical process is insufficiently warranted.

To me if alum is spread on the chicken and turkey droppings let the factory take care of it its their problem anyway.

Because ten years is not that much difference.

Because of the time you are only gaining ten years.

Because it's only 10 years difference. And I think they could use this money on other issues that need fixing now

Because it would be too costly for the household and you would change your mind and use it for something else

I am against raising anyone's taxes. I don't think that this threatens humans safety.

I think 125.00 for each household in the state of Oklahoma is way too much.

It is not worth it since it only shaves off 10 years.

I would vote against it, because it is only a ten year difference, and that is money that we could use elsewhere in these current times.

They made the mess, they should clean it up

It only takes off 10 years, if it reduced it further I would vote for it.

It should be done naturally and 10 years is not a significant amount of time

Well 2 things if it's just for scenic there is other rivers that people could visit that doesn't have algae. Just wait the 10 years because of the cost to people

Mostly, you are only saving 10 years. After 50 years, what's another 10 years? I believe that the money could be better spent on healthcare.

I can't afford it

It will only be 10 years more and the tax money needs to be spent on roads and other more important things.

Because there are more rivers and lakes that need the clean up.

I agree with it but it's because of the \$405

Sometimes scientists are just guessing

N reason for the taxpayers to pay for that kind of stuff

The money set aside for this will not be used for this

Because it is something you can't do anything about

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted "against" the program.**

Ten years was not that good
I would need more information about it before I would vote for it, on the safety issues
Money could be used on other issues
Raising taxes for environmental issue is something . It will take several years for it to take effect. Aquatic action would work better. We should explore other options. Working above the lake would be money better spent.
Because there are other lakes that won't be affected.
Because it should be done in the entire state and not just eastern Oklahoma
I would rather see the money spent on something else
Ten years difference really doesn't make a difference
If it will naturally occur in 60 years instead 50 would not be worth it.
Its not an area that I go to. It should be done. I don't go there. If there is a fee it should be fixed by the people that cause the problem.
It's just for one lake and there are several in Oklahoma that need help.
Because there is not enough time difference, is the state going to prevent this from happening in the future. To much money.
I think the chicken people have got to quit dumping it, and that's not much time difference to cost that much money
I don't think they need to do the alum treatments but they need to ban the chicken litter. That's just too much money!
The money will come out of a lot of pockets that can't afford it. It will correct itself in 10 years
Because of the tax and don't know what the court is going to decide about the poultry litter; concerned about the poultry farmers and the price increase to them
I don't think that the 10 years difference is worth it
Because I believe it I do not think I am going to be around in 60 years or 50 years it not that much difference for the lake to straight up to make a different.
They do not need to be spending anymore money on environmental issues.
Because of tax increase
10 years shorter is not very important. I'd rather they spend the money on something else that we have already discussed. I think banning of poultry litter is the main issue and should have already been done
Too long time 5 years its not the solution it's a band aid
Because I feel that the money could be better spent someplace else; not necessarily for an environmental issue.
Basically because the 10 years difference is not worth it.
I think that the algae will go away naturally in ten years more. There are other issues that are more important that our money could be spent on.
Two reasons - the difference between 50 years and 60 years is not that big of a difference and \$80 is a lot of money and I wouldn't want to put that money towards that.
It takes too long to work.
Because it doesn't seem logical to pay the additional cost if the lake returned to normal in only ten years longer.
There are more important things they should be worried about the drinking water. Even if they stop the ban the waste will still be in the soil.
Expense is not worth the small reduction in time to improve the lake.



**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**

It would only cut ten years off for the phosphorus. We would spending a total cost and it would be 45 million dollars. When you look at it that way we can spend money on education and prisons. We could spend our money other things. A big waste.

I feel it would be useless since natural processes would clear the water up in 50 years, 10 years less time doesn't make that much difference.

If poultry litter is banned, the natural processes would take care of the problem

Its only ten years difference. That's too much money to take from everyone for just that one area.

That's too much to be levied at one time with so little notice

It wasn't enough difference in the time span .

I don't want my taxes raised

It costs too much. It's not a good economy right now.

Would prefer nature takes care of itself; when we try to clean up something we did it may cause another problem

I think the hunters and fisherman should pay this on there fishing and hunting license; because if they can afford the boat and everything it takes they can afford the treatments for the lake and they are the ones using the lake and others don't use lake

Because it will go back naturally in a 10 year difference; use the money in other projects, parks, other recreation places

10 years difference is not enough time to make a difference

The ten year difference and it would only benefit one lake in Oklahoma.

Because 10 years is not enough to spend that much money

Why pay billions for a repair of 10 years when we need more money for roads and education

10 years is not that much longer

Only 10 years is not enough to spend that amount of money

If it will go back that way we need to let nature take care of it we are getting the cart before the horse by wanting to put alum without the ban already in place. They will have our money and can do what they want with it.

Ten year is not enough time to pay for it

Because on card n it says it doesn't make any time difference you're just wasting time and money you say 50 to 60 years on card n; no time difference

Mostly because without treatments there much difference in the time span; I'm a single parent; time frame isn't speeding anything up;

Seems like a big expense for something that takes so long and will naturally take care of itself

It won't effect me I don't pay taxes; I don't want to say yes if there might be someone out there that does pay taxes that wont be able to afford it I like the alum idea but not sure of effect

Mainly the \$405.00 amount; if it were spread out into payments it may be different that time of year is not a good time to put out extra money

Because the natural process will turn the lake to what it was in ten year difference isn't enough to make me say let's do it if you with fifty years with and sixty without might as well wait

Because eventually it will settle any way without; it would be nice to see the change; I have 4 children to think about; 10 years difference isn't much of a difference just wait on the natural process; 205 is a lot for one household

The household cannot afford to pay it, its not worth spending the money for this short time.

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted "against" the program.**

That's a lot of money for alum treatments. I think the lake would clear up a lot faster on its own.
The ten year difference is not significant enough to justify the expense. It's a waste of tax money
Because natural process will return the lake to 1960 conditions
She wants the money to be spent in other ways to help in other ways needed.
I think the money could be spent on something better; this is just ten years difference anyway
For different reason because I do not think they will carry through with it. I cannot afford it.
Because I have to pay enough taxes.
Because cannot afford it. But will like to see it done.
Because I may not be alive.
I can not afford the \$405.
I hope they don't ban all spreading of litter everywhere. People need the fertilizer--they just need to spread it around more.
Ten years does not make that much of a difference for the amount of money we would have to pay
Many programs are much more important than this one right now i.e., health care, road repairs, etc.
The industry should pay. The economy is too bad.
Because \$405 is a lot to me which could be used for schools or something. I don't go there. Ten years longer is not that much.
\$405 per household is too much; considering all the household's in Oklahoma that's a lot of money. Only knocking it down ten years is not worth the money.
Because I don't have the money to fix the stream and because we have paid plenty on taxes. I don't now where they do their cut backs but someone needs to cut back
Because it will naturally clear itself in 10 years and I can't afford it because I'm sending my daughter through college. I never seen the government with tax they didn't like. If they tax you once they will tax you again.
Only a ten year difference.
Not worth the money spent.
The length of time involved.
It wouldn't effect me in this area. P no
The laws of unintended consequences. They don't know what the effects of the alum will be.
I think there are more important issues.
Not much of a pay back for a difference of ten years and I would rather spend the money to repair roads
10 years doesn't make that much of a difference and the money could be spent in better ways
It is not my responsibility to clean up and pay for what those businesses have done
At my age it is not that important to me personally. If I were younger and I was still fishing I might vote for it because it might be more important to me.
I think it would be preferable to allow nature to do this instead of adding something else to the mix why pay for something that nature is going to do
Because people can't afford any more taxes, especially the elderly, they can't afford it, there needs to be another way to pay for it other than raising the taxes.
It's going to clear on it's own, it will just take a little longer without the alum treatment, why should we spend the additional money?
The additional expense should be applied to some other area that would not require 50 years to see progress.
Because I'm tight with my money and there is already enough taxes being taken out. I'm tight with my money.
It is a good idea but they should spend the money on something else.

---

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**


---

I think if the earth can do it itself and not cost the taxpayers then we just need to leave it alone. I think the money would be better placed elsewhere.

Because it will be cleaned up naturally within ten years of that date and all the money that will take to do it. People they are going to have to hire and train just think that it will be major improvement in fifty years anyway

Because natural processes are going to return the lake back to its natural state in 60 years anyway. 10 years is not that big of difference. Rather state use the money for something more short term. Not good use of money. Not cost effective

That amount of money is only buying that much time

Doesn't really affect our family...especially Tenkiller lake

Because financial reasons

Because it would not be done for all the other lakes that needed it

If I'm going to pay extra taxes I'd rather it go to our county

Because it will correct itself naturally and the alum will not make a rapid improvement if it would make an immediate dramatic change that would be different

I don't think they are going to win the law suit from what I've heard

Because of the amount of I would have to pay. It will take fifty years to clean up and I would be seventy and probably dead or not able to enjoy it.

Because they will not use the money for the program. I would say yes, if it was affecting us here in our city.

Because I wont be here in 60 years.

Need to resort to natural resources, though alum may not be a chemical. Treating, manipulating nature is one reason we have problems now. Unnatural things can cause all kinds of conditions. Have worked against unnatural methods for many years

Because it won't benefit me and it will take care of itself and I can't imagine dumping something into the lake that is not natural to the lake and if I got water in my mouth it would taste bitter.

I think with the way the economy is the people can't afford to pay the 125 some of us don't even have money for groceries. X nothing other than the long term of time if they can wait 50 years they can wait 60 years

Because it is only a ten year difference.

Because there should not be any more taxes than we already pay. I am not a big fan of the army corp of engineers anyway. But they should ban the spreading of litter.

Not worth it!!!

I cannot afford that.

Well a umm I don't know if it would actually make things better or not x I wonder what other alternatives people have to getting rid of the litter x if people didn't add pollution to the water it would eventually clean itself

It's a waste of time and a waste of money.

The tax increase is more than my household can afford to pay. If they would spread the payment out over more years, I would vote yes. I have seen the good it can do.

Because they are doing something mother nature is going to do on it's own. I think it might even clear up sooner.

It is going to return within ten years and improving anyway on it's own. \$80 though not much to me is a lot to some people.

Because it only brings it back to the 1960 quality ten years sooner. Reason 2 is: even though this has worked other places, scientist may not know all the effects that it may have on life in the river. There are better places

---



**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**

to put our money.
Nature will clear it up by itself. It could be a mistake to do the treatments.
It's ridiculous to pay that amount for a ten years. That is really too much to ask. I don't see any reason to add more crap to the lake. I don't believe anyone could know what the effects of the breakdown of the alum would lead to in the future.
Can't afford it. That's the only reason. Otherwise, if I could afford it, I would.
I agree with the, it'll eventually get taken care of by the natural processes.
See comment last question “it's not enough gain”, because, like one of those questions said, there are other things to spend the money on - fix the bridges.
That's that litter stuff, isn't it? I don't know. I don't remember.
Because the tax. That's it.
Because many people would not be able to afford it.
I cannot afford it. P I cannot afford it on my taxes.
I'm on a fixed income, very small. P that's it just couldn't afford it.
Because of the amount it's too high
Because of the cost and the government let them do it. P the government wants the taxpayer to bail them out.
I'm not going to be here in 50 years. People in Oklahoma pay enough taxes and we don't know what it's being used for. They'll end up asking for more money before it's over.
What's ten years? This is the poorest county in the state. I'll be too old to ever see it.
Because we are going to be taxed for the cost of what the state should have known about and prevented decades ago.
They get enough money and are not using it right and in 50 or 60 years I won't be here anyway. Get some algae eating fish!
Ten years doesn't seem like that much of a save to me
Because without alum it would take 50 years and with it only 10 years more. I think the ban should be implemented.
Because the tax is too high for your household to pay.
Because I'm against.
The cost
I want it be done naturally .
On a fixed income and can't afford it
I believe that that's not the correct way to correct the problem, we need to get to the source of the problem and eliminate it.
It's been 48 years since around 1960. It will go back to that level in 60 years without the alum treatments so it will take just a little bit more time to go back to the way it was without any influence from us.
Taxes could go for better things. It will clean itself in 10 years,
It is too costly for just ten years.
I don't want a total ban.
Let mother nature take it's course.
We can't afford anymore money on taxes
The state should be asking the chicken farmers to pay for this, not us!
I don't think the treatments amounts to anything that the river would clear up on its own



---

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**


---

Tax might be spent better in other areas of the state

---

Because it would only take 10 more years without the alum treatments. That's it.

---

If they do get the ban it would take 10 more years for it to naturally clean up and does not want to give the state another \$400

---

Lake is clear already and fishing would not be as good

---

I can give you about a thousand reasons. One, I'll be dead. And secondly, the difference between fifty and sixty years is not worth the effort and the money. And I don't agree with it; there are too many holes in the argument.

---

In ten more years, it's going to clear up on its own, anyway. Usually a one-time payment doesn't stop there. I don't have the \$45 to give to them on something that will work itself out. Now stopping the spread of the litter, I'm all for that

---

Because I couldn't afford the tax money being paid. That's about it.

---

Because I don't, I mean 10 years; it's not much of a distance. If would've knocked off like 30 years, I would think it would have been worth it

---

What they're looking at is the Illinois river, barren fork creek, and flint creek. If we were to approve this one-time tax for this area of Oklahoma, we have other areas of Oklahoma where it would need to be done also, and we'll have to have to tax it

---

I think money could [be] used for education and crimes instead the alum treatment is not threat to health and it [is] going to return anyway it will just take a little bit longer.

---

Its not going to do it much faster. And our household just can't afford it!

---

I'm more for the all natural process. Get rid of the reason there is too much phosphorus in the first place.

---

This is for one particular lake and it should be any more important than any of our other lakes and that is a lot of money. Maybe we should spend more money on other issues.

---

It's ridiculous. Ten years difference is not enough to pay that kind of money!!

---

That's a lot of money and it still takes 50 years.

---

For me it would be the cost it would be a problem since it would only be 10 years longer I don't think it would be necessary

---

Because of the cost

---

Because I don't know if I could afford the cost I have a house payment

---

Because it's just going to make a difference of 10 years.

---

There are more important things to spend money on than Tenkiller lake where people around here don't even go to

---

It costs too much

---

If they're stopping turkey farmers from spreading manure don't think ten year difference would make too long for them to predict whether 10 years is gonna make any difference or not if it would have cleared up in 10-20 years I woulda voted yes

---

I cannot afford to pay the entire \$405 in one year and do not want to risk losing my house because I can't pay my tax bill due to this program.

---

It's not about money. They need to ban the dangers causing it. Way I see it is you gotta stop what's causing it. I just, um, everybody spends the money and it's just a way for a new program, make a bunch of people a bunch of money, basically

---

One of the reasons is because it will return to its natural state in 60 years and the other reason is that I'm a teacher and I believe that, as a teacher, our schools and teachers are underpaid and underappreciated and monies could be utilized there

---

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted "against" the program.**

One thing, because the amount of the tax. And another thing, I personally don't go around any of the places you've mentioned. And another reason, I won't be here in another 50 years any how so I won't know whether the tax money and that's being done

60 years is not much longer 59 years.

Too expensive and many people cannot afford it. With the economy the way it is, this is not a good time.

There have to be restrictions on everything we do and to not spread the litter is not unreasonable to my way of thinking. I am against pollution, but it begins with us.

Since the lake and river will return to 1960 conditions we could probably benefit with the money going to something else. The ban will correct the problem. It is important, but there are other things the state needs to spend money on.

Prefer my tax money spent in other areas because I have not heard of this problem

Because of the economy, we have so many banks and people going under, this is not a good time for a tax increase

It's going to take too long anyway. The cost. I think it's mostly for looks.

It does not affect all the rivers and it will take too long 60 years.

The cost and the economy made me vote against it.

I don't agree with artificial intervention of men to do what nature can do by itself

I'm from Louisiana. I just got out of the air force. I have never heard of any of the these lakes or rivers, my dad lives here in Oklahoma.

We need to worry how we are going to get out of this financial debt we have gotten our country into.

Why did they pick me, because I work for the state or because I have a creek up the road? I do not think alum is the answer.

Alum is not strong enough for probably all the algae

Might not affect some areas and my area might be one not affected

Simply because if they knew it they should have done it earlier get the money from somewhere else than the people

Because it only helps the lakes mentioned and not the others. And I can't afford that extra taxes.

Because it won't make that big of a difference if it's going to return back anyway. We have bridges that to be repaired first.

Too much money for my household

10 year increase is not very important

Ah I think it would be a good idea but not if tax payers have to pay a fee of four hundred dollars x no

I didn't think the benefit was that great.

Make the corporations that caused the problem pay for the cleanup.

Because we already have enough taxes.

You only get 10 years improvement and there are better ways to spend tax payers money.

I feel that it is an important issue, no one wants algae growing in our water, but I feel that there are other things going on in the state that should be dealt with.

Because the lake would return to what it was like in 60 years in stead of the 50 years if we spent the money.

The time frame there seems insignificant.

Well, there are a whole lot of better ways to spend the money. I have gone through the welfare system, as have my kids, and the money could be spent on medical care for children.

I think they should wait out the process and let it take sixty years instead of fifty.

---

**Table D.102. Why respondents voted “against” the program.**

---

It's just money wise, it's just basically that money is tight

Just for the simple fact that I already have bills and I can't afford much more

---

**Verbatim responses explaining why respondents said “don’t know” to the vote question**

Respondents were asked question W2, “Could you tell me why you aren’t sure?” if they answered “don’t know” to question W1, “Now please tell me whether you vote for or against the alum treatments, which would cost your household a one time additional tax of \$ (BIDAMT).”

---

**Table D.103. Why respondents said “don’t know” to the vote question**

---

I am more neutral, I don't pay taxes so I am neutral

125 is a fair amount, however I would like to see that money used for schools prison and roads we are talking only about 10 years we have bigger issues now not this, if the lake was never going to get clean I might have a different answer

No comment

Put this in on voting question; needs more information pros and cons

No comment

It's complicated I'll try to summarize. Evidence supporting the alum treatments implemented in other states has shown significant improvement in the local waterways; the long-term effects of alum treatments has not been ascertained properly.

I understand that it would be good but that 45 dollars is a lot to me right now

---

**Verbatim responses explaining why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other**

Respondents were asked question Q56b, “Please tell me what made you think that it tried to push you to vote one way or the other.” if they answered “pushed one way or another” to question Q56, “Thinking about all the information I gave you, overall, did it try to push you to vote one way or the other, or did it let you make up your own mind about which way to vote?” and if they answered either pushed to vote “for” or pushed to vote “against” in question Q56a, “Which way did it try to push you to vote?” A listing of all responses to this question are provided in Table D.104 below.

---

**Table D.104. Why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other**

---

The tax is too high for one lake

Because of the cost. I mean I'm all for it if it'd work but I can't afford that much. Like if it was \$100, it might be different. Or even if it's based on somebody's income.

I really could not tell you. It was just the feeling I got during the presentation. It pushed more toward voting yes.

---

**Table D.104. Why respondents felt pushed to vote one way or the other**

Lots of explanation about what the alum would do. P no
The information that it presented
The way the information was presented the way in 1960 to now we can get it back to 1960 it never said it would go back by itself until later
Because the objective was revealed before the obligation.
Material was presented by people who wanted this work to be done
The part where it tells you it will take sixty years without treatment and fifty with treatment. I think that if the treatment time cut in half from sixty to thirty years it will make more of an impact.
It pushed me toward the alum treatments overall, more information on the alum and not a lot of information on why the amount to pay.
Repeated information to push toward the alum treatments.
The comparison that was presented
Gave me helpful information
Very, very, very slightly slanted toward voting for it; I think if you want to give a non biased appearance to the survey you need to supply more information about the pros and cons about what alum would do with alum treatments and give more examples of others
The way the information was presented to him
Provided detailed information on the lake and what it would take to clean it up.
Seems like more information about voting for it and everything about the alum was positive
Like it's putting a case out there and pushing it. This is one way. No the only way.
Allowing the fertilizer to be used
Because it emphasized all of the possible positives of the alum treatment.
Just the, um, ah, the way they come across and the questions.
It was the only option being presented
Just seemed like it. A lot of information
It's [a] forced choice
Just all the information that, because I didn't know anything about that until now

**Verbatim responses explaining other reasons people felt pushed**

Respondents were asked question Q56b, "Please tell me what made you think that it tried to push you to vote one way or the other." if they answered "pushed one way or another" to question Q56, "Thinking about all the information I gave you, overall, did it try to push you to vote one way or the other, or did it let you make up your own mind about which way to vote?" and if they answered "other" in question Q56a, "Which way did it try to push you to vote?" A listing of all the "other" responses are provided in Table D.105 below



**Table D.105. Other reasons why respondents felt pushed**


---

I think the ban would do it itself

---

See previous comment

---

With the information that i had it just helped me to decide and thinking of my children

---

It made me want to vote no on everything for the rest of my life.

---

The cost

---

### **Verbatim responses from interviewers about respondents difficulty understanding what they were told**

If interviewers answered yes to D5, "Did the respondent say anything suggesting that he or she had any difficulty understanding what you told him or her?", they were asked to fill out D5a, "Describe the difficulties." Table D.106 below lists all of the responses people gave to this question.

**Table D.106. Interviewers comments about respondents' difficulty understanding what they were told**


---

Seemed very tired and smelled like pot in his apt... I went through the interview anyway, as i have had a hard time catching him at home.

---

Need some questions repeated

---

The only thing that made me think that was the answers to the "when you voted" questions. I never know if they didn't understand the material we presented or if they just have their own ideas, which differ.

---

Only on the complex questions about what she was thinking when she voted, but the confusion was quickly cleared up.

---

Only her answers which indicated that she hadn't actually been indoctrinated by the presentation. She seemed to be listening and did not seem confused.

---

Had difficulty hearing

---

R - appears to have health problems and memory problems, is elderly, and wife had to be in room to make him understand some questions

---

Only that he didn't seem to differentiate the severity of the phosphorus being washed out of the river more quickly than the lake; which is very common among respondents, though the difference is emphasized.

---

When we reached the "what were you thinking, when you voted" questions, i was surprised that r did not understand more.

---

He voted against the treatment because he was against the ban. He's all for the treatment. He feels the spreading of litter should be regulated, not banned, because people just put the litter on top of the grass, sometimes 4-6 inches thick, without

---

At the end, respondent said he didn't know what i meant he was talking to me at first like he understood then he said he didn't

---

She was afraid we were going to take her money now and she said she doesn't know about what's going on in rivers and lakes she never goes to them

---

### Verbatim responses from interviewers about any additional comments

At the end of each interview, interviewers were asked to fill out question D10, "Do you have any other comments about this interview?" Table D.107 below lists all of the responses people gave to this question.<sup>7</sup>

**Table D.107. Additional comments from interviewers**

Talked a lot about a lot of issues, had to keep getting back on subject
Read sentence
Read sentence
Read sentence
Excellent interview
Respondent wants check in roommate's name
Elderly couple, very alert
Respondent's lady friend was present
Read sentence
R wanted to finish this quickly.
R really did not like turning the pages; he stated that eliminating blank pages would have saved money to help pay for the alum treatments. There were a few interruptions with people coming in and out.
Girlfriend was there but she didn't say anything no comments from her
Ru was very interested in cleaning up the pollution
Ru was concerned about the pollution but didn't know if the money would do it
Ru wants the river and lake cleaned up but he thinks the money and the time is just a wild guess on their part
Ru was more interested in the money that it was costing than the clean
Ru was interested but not in spending money for this
Read sentence
Read sentence
Had tv on loud a little difficult for me but she seemed to function very well in the environment
The respondent was about his nap: but woke up to answer the questions.
Respondent knew more about the study than i could tell him. Almost enjoyable experience
Respondent's wife was there
He had company coming over and his wife was not feeling well
She was very aware of the issues through the papers.
Respondent is 19 years old and goes to school. His parents claim him on their taxes. He still would vote no.
I was very impressed he sat 16 years on the state legislature. His son is currently [the] democratic leader in the oklahoma house.
They said they have a hard time trusting people that was one of the reasons they lived in a gated community.
He was telling me that he lost his wife back in 1994.
Seemed very nervous he has been in the country for 1/2 years and is taking electronic engineering. I did the interview outside. He did not have any furniture. I did not even see a television.
I was surprised that they asked him for \$405.00. His apt was hardly furnished. He had long hair, and seemed

7. These verbatim responses to not include the following answers: "no comment" and "no comments."

**Table D.107. Additional comments from interviewers**

very nervous. I tried to set him at ease.
Respondent gave me a great deal of information that relevant to the study.
R was very attentive. She called her younger son down to tell him about the lake, and had me repeat a few questions.
Very alert. He's 92 years old
Ru wants to spend the money on other things
The kids had tv on and it was hard to read over that but ru was interested in the study
The respondent understood very well and very eloquent in his idiom
Very nice
Very nice
Very nice people
Really nice young man
Very knowledgeable about the area and situation
Read sentence
None, the respondent did the interview very well and with the understanding that the incentive is \$50
The r. Was very talkative in the interview and was concerned about the water for the future and really wants it clean. [comment deleted]
None. He was very knowledgeable about the subject and interested
Very interested in the treatment
[Comment deleted]
Comment deleted
R burned a pan of food and interview was done in smoke.
Respondent's wife was present, respondent has had a stroke and his speech is slurred and slow so his wife confirmed what he was saying at times.
Respondent was very open to the interview and was very interested in the study.
Good interview
Good interview.
Ru wants to clean up the river and lake but can't afford the money
She has been a resident of the state 6 years, did seem distracted and tired
Comment deleted
Husband is a truck driver and he knew all about problems
They are moving from [address deleted] to the new address given in the computer.
Mary and robert were a team and both added their comments during survey. Her cell number is the number that was given
A nice lady
Comment deleted
Very good interview r very knowledgeable
R was very interested in this because they are farmers but wants to know more about the effects of alum, very good interview
Respondent is a former state legislator and very well informed on the issue
Comment deleted
[Comment deleted]
Respondent's husband was present but i only took her opinions. They were very different from his

**Table D.107. Additional comments from interviewers**

The spouse was present
His comment is that droppings can be used to make methane, why can
The respondent felt strongly about voting for the alum, but had serious reservations as to whether or not she could afford a one lump sum payment. She is on social security and also did not understand how she would be billed for this as she doesn't pay taxes due to income of social security.
R was ill so he asked his mother to complete the interview on his behalf
Attentive, involved participant.
Respondent was very good at giving her opinion.
Respondent said that he was glad that he did the study.
Parents began the interview, but father left after the first few questions. Mother stayed, but was not involved in helping [name deleted] respond. She was interested and involved in the responses.
[Comment deleted]
Respondent says that the study was totally different than he thought.
Respondent was somewhat distracted by her dogs. She rescues miniature schnauzers and has 15 in the home.
R was very interested in cleaning up the environment, she was very interested in cleaning up the river and lake. This was a very good interview
Respondent gave me a lot information.
Elderly lady not feeling very well and extremely impatient.
He is not opposed of the alum treatment but would prefer nature to take of it
[Comment deleted]
[Comment deleted]
She had several dogs jumping up and on both of us throughout interview.
Comment deleted
Company arrived in middle of interview
He never turned off his tv movie and was constantly looking at it.
[Comment deleted]
He found a lot of errors in your show cards verses what i was saying
Very good interview r was very interested in this subject he is an avid fisherman
This family knows all about this area, grew up there. Very knowledgeable.
Elderly man knew a little about this from what he has read was very interested in it and thinks it should be cleaned up for future generations
Her sister who is deaf was present.
Respondent is in recovery from surgery. She was in need of her money.
Comment deleted
Respondent says he likes having a lot of large mouth bass in the lake. R also confirmed location of house on map and description of house.
Some distraction due to the presence of a busy two year old
The incentive has been changed to fifty dollars.
Comment deleted
Respondent was repairing an icebox while the interview took place. He glanced at the show cards once an a while. Respondent stated that he should not have to pay for this. Respondent also stated that the river has always looked the way it does
There were children, pets and respondent in and out of the room.
Respondent says he hopes the federal court passes the ban



**Table D.107. Additional comments from interviewers**

Respondent was very glad to participate
Distraction from one year old baby
Had to speak loud and paraphrase a few things so respondent could understand had trouble reading the charts especially the maps
Respondent asked if she could get cash instead of check. I did give her cash
Interview went very well, r was very interested in this
R very interested in this clean up of the water
Interview had to be done very fast, r had plans to go out with friends
Very lovely people, very interested. Interview took quite along time because of r telling stories and talking about the past.
Interview went very well
Only that the address was easily located, though the previous interviewer had indicated that the address did not exist.
[Address deleted] it is indeed the du indicated on the map and in the listing sheet. Also, another very talkative respondent, though she had been told that to finish in a timely manner it would be advisable to limit comments to the question being asked. Respondent does have minor children living in the hh but did not wish to list them. Since i could not see how it would affect the outcome of respondent selection, i did not press for the information.
They receive there mail in a po box [address deleted]
New 911 addresses
She said i could have saved a lot of time if i had just cut to the chase.
There was a 9 month old baby here that kind of distracted her.
He wants to me to add ssss' to the end of his "yessssss" vote.
R was concerned as to the effect the alum would have on the actual water. Would like more information on the effect. Would like to know if all the fertilizer they put on the fields would be as bad as the chicken waste?
He was very talkative. Lives alone and i think he was glad to have company.
There was a ten month old baby here, but she was paying attention.
I was glad that the respondent's husband was there, because i think she would have declined had he not supported it.
Only that this respondent has given this subject much thought. Also, the listing of the address of this du was not done logically, but the interviewer selected the house which the lister's map indicated. The interviewer had to use his best judgment
R had three small children present during the first half of the interview, but interviewer made sure to repeat anything she might have missed
No. R is moving across the street but will still receive the check at this address.
It took a while to convince the r to participate.
He stated that he wanted to vote for it but could not afford the tax.
Address is [address deleted]
[Comment deleted] we did it [the interview] in my car.
[Comment deleted]
R was busy with many calling and dropping by, but she took time to do the survey to the exclusion of other distractions.
Comment deleted
Read sentence

**Table D.107. Additional comments from interviewers**

Read sentence
[Comment deleted]
Yes, the respondent was extremely knowledgeable and made several comments during the interview.
Many distractions from children coming in and out.
Respondent's husband has a son that has a poultry farm and he is against the government stopping the spreading so they are not for this program
She was very interested in this river being cleaned
Very interested in this being done
Respondent was concerned about the money but was for the alum treatments she was very interested
Not very intelligent, but very sweet older gentleman.
Respondent was very interested in cleaning up the lake and river
Respondent was getting sleepy before we finished. So he was having a hard time at the end
R wanted me to ask his sister if he could be interviewed. R's sister is very protective of her brother and was present during the entire interview. R has some cerebral palsy but his mind is good. He has been on the job for over 35 years.
He seemed to be informed about state government, knew that the attorney general was suing arkansas for the poultry litter.
His suggestion is to use poultry droppings as a fuel. Wife said that it was misleading to put alum with the seasonings
Interview conducted at r's place of business in fort smith, ar. R talks and thinks extremely fast. This is her business, she had myriad phone calls, questions that needed to be answered, etc. She quickly and efficiently took care of business
We were out on the porch being eaten by mosquitoes!
R is receiving unemployment so check goes to his wife.
Ru was hoping the state would do something to clear up the water
An elderly lady.
Ru wanted the water cleaned up but said he couldn't pay for it
Ru was interested in clearing up the lake for her child
Ru had kids that needed her some during interview but she was interested in learning more about the pollution in the river and lake
Couple were having an argument when i came up. Atmosphere was very tense.
Not sure if she understood all the survey she talked about the money more
Elderly lady loves to talk
R helps care for his 84 year old grandmother so there were some interruptions.
Yes! R told me that [address deleted] was his correct address when i asked him at the door. At the end when i read his address back to him, he said that he'd thought that i had said that his address was wrong (???)
R's grandson came home during the interview and there were times that r needed to respond to him.
R's son was in and out with questions and behaviors. There were a number of interruptions.
Ru was very interested in study
One interruption in the beginning
The father was there.
She said she worked for the state. She was very adamant for some reason about putting alum in the fields. She was nice but firm.
The respondent was easily distracted by her small dog. But she seemed to follow all the info i was reading out.

**Table D.107. Additional comments from interviewers**

Read sentence
Read sentence
Read sentence
Respondent was very concerned about chicken farmers and where the farmers will be able to put the chicken litter if the alum treatment is done.
Respondent says the interview was not what he thought it was going to be about.
Respondent was at first anti-government but did agree to do the interview.
Respondent was very attentive and she even took notes
Respondent did very well because she has three little girls to keep up with during the interview.
The respondent said she could care less about the lakes or the river and she thought that the cost of cleaning up the lake and river should be done by someone else.
The respondent was multi-tasking with her pc at first but she finally finished what she was doing and fully participated in the interview.
Respondent did not know and did not want to guess at his mother and stepfather's income.
Baby woke up, but grandpa took baby, who then got hungry and needed to be fed, but great interview was completed.
R is very skeptical about getting the ban in place.
Good respondent.
R stopped her kitchen work to listen and respond.
Great, interested respondent.
R was very attentive and receptive.
Attentive, serious young man.
Lost power during the screener
R stated that she loved the rivers in colorado and she would love it if the lakes would be clear but it's too expensive to make the changes
Thinks it is really important to stop poultry litter
Respondent had to wait for her husband to get off the phone so that he could answer the questions about the income tax
R seemed like he was not too much into the interview he seemed like he just was not to interested in the subject we were discussing